

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

32692

Customer Number

OCT 14 2004

Patent
Case No.: 545388 US012

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: SMITH, KENNETH L.

Application No.: 09/870226

Group Art Unit: 1772

Filed: May 30, 2001

Examiner: Looney, Donald J.

Title: CUBE CORNER CAVITY BASED RETROREFLECTORS WITH
TRANSPARENT FILL MATERIALRESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111 (NON-FINAL OA) AND 1 MONTH EXTENSIONMail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION (37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
- ☒ transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (703) 872-9306.

Oct 14, 2004
DateShannon M Bruce
Signed by:

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the outstanding Office Action, dated 06/17/2004, in the above-identified application.

This Response is believed to be timely submitted. It is believed that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

Under the provisions of 37 CFR § 1.136(a), Applicant petitions to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application. The requested extension and appropriate fee are as follows (check time period desired):

- ☒ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(1) - Extension within first month
- ☐ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(2) - Extension within second month
- ☐ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(3) - Extension within third month
- ☐ 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(4) - Extension within fourth month.

Please charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3723.

One copy of this sheet marked duplicate is also enclosed.

Application No.: 09/870226

Case No.: 54538US012

that an observer at or near the source of the light could detect the reflected light. In other words, the structure of Chau would not be retroreflective.

Although Chau et al. says that any type of surface topography can be used to make his reflective article, the reference provides no suggestion as to what type of surface topography is meant. This teaching is only a general statement and does nothing to suggest that a retroreflective surface should be used. In fact, it is submitted that the use of a retroreflective surface would not produce collimated light to the display as required by Chau. This is because the retroreflective surface is a discontinuous surface. These discontinuities introduce interference patterns into the reflected light that would reduce the collimation of light returned to the display. This is contrary to the goal of Chau. Consequently, the combination suggested by the Examiner would not be appropriate.

It is noted that the Examiner has not provided any specific support for the rejection of claims 16-21 or 36-37. Applicants submit that these claims are each patentable over the combination of references relied upon for additional reasons. Specifically, the Applicant submits that each of these claims add limitations that are neither disclosed in, nor suggested by, either of the references.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Allowance of all pending claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

October 14, 2004
Date

By: James V. Lilly
James V. Lilly, Reg. No.: 77,817
Telephone No.: (651) 733-1543

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833